

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 13-18, and 20 have been examined and rejected on prior art grounds.

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the claimed invention can be implemented as software routine, and therefore fails to fall within a statutory category of invention.

Independent claims 1 and 6 are amended to recite that the system comprises a processor. These amendments are supported at least by paragraph 63 of the specification. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11, 13-18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/009537 to Wang et al. (hereinafter “Wang”). Applicants submit that the claims are patentable.

Previously, Applicants argued that Wang does not teach that a control device transmits a selected neutral user interface to the gateway, and that the gateway converts the transmitted neutral user interface into a device specific user interface which is suitable for the specific client of the user, as recited by claim 1. In contrast, Wang only discloses the generation of text-only versions of customized HN directories.

Initially, Applicants note that the Examiner does not directly respond to the above argument in the “Response to Arguments” section (page 2 of the Office Action). The Examiner

merely cites paragraphs 102-108, 113, 181, and 287 of Wang to allege that the above features are taught (See the detailed rejection of claim 1 on pages 4-5 of the Office Action). The portions of Wang cited by the Examiner are directed to the forming of the top-level GUI 220. Specifically, paragraph 105 discloses that ICONs from devices connected to the network 100 are collected together and displayed in a top level network devices page 220 for selection by a user. A user may click on an icon reference of any of the devices in the top-level user control page 220 to access that particular device's HTML control page GUI. Paragraph 287 discloses that text-only versions of customized HN directories (e.g., home network top level GUI 1054, Home Network Directory Page) may be generated depending on the capabilities of the device displaying the directory.

The Examiner asserts that Wang teaches a discovery process for every device which gathers device information from devices connected to the network to generate the top-level user control page for the home network (See page 4 of the Office Action). Here, the Examiner seems to assert that each of Wang's ICONs are transmitted from devices connected to the network 100 to form the top level page 220 and thus concludes that the claimed transmitting of a neutral user interface selected by the user from the integrated user interface is taught.

However, Wang discloses that a selection of an ICON occurs after the ICONs are collected to form top level page 220 is formed (paragraph 106). Accordingly, Wang's general disclosure of collecting all of the ICONs corresponding to the devices to be included in the top-level GUI 220 falls short of teaching that any of the ICONs are selected by a user and then collected. Thus, under the Examiner's current interpretation, Wang does not teach the transmitting of a neutral user interface selected by the user from the alleged integrated user interface (top level page 220).

Even if the Examiner had more appropriately alleged that the fetched device page 202, rather than the ICONs collected to form the top level page 220, corresponds to the claimed neutral user interface selected by a user, Wang would not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims. In particular, Wang does not explicitly disclose that the device page 202 of the particular device selected by the user is customized to a device displaying the page. Instead, the only portion of Wang which discloses such customization (paragraph 287) merely discloses that the home network directories, such as top level GUI 220, are accommodated based on the capabilities of the device displaying the directory. Thus, Applicants submit that Wang does not teach that the alleged transmitted neutral user interface (fetched device page 202) is converted into a device specific user interface which is suitable for the specific client of the user, as recited by claim 1.

Because Wang does not teach all of the features of claim 1, Applicants submit that the claim is not anticipated by Wang. Applicants also submit that claims 2-5 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Each of independent claims 6, 7, 10, 14, and 17 recite features similar to those discussed above in conjunction with claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable at least for reasons analogous to those discussed above regarding claim 1.

Applicants also submit that claims 8-9, 11, 13, 15-16, 18, and 20 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on one of claims 6, 7, 10, 14, and 17.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
/ S. Stuart Lee /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 14, 2009

S. Stuart Lee
Registration No. 61,124